Washington State Department of Transportation

SoundTransit

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
SR-520/TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND INDUSTRY, SEATTLE
JUNE 10, 2002 — 4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.

INTRODUCTION, WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

The Advisory Committee of the Trans-Lake Washington Project met on June 10, 2002. The meeting focus was on the project's approach to pricing and managed lanes, high capacity transit (HCT) accommodation, localized impacts criteria, status of project alternatives, and an update on state and regional funding. Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, introduced new Advisory Committee replacements Jonathan Dubman, for the Montlake Community Club (replacing Jean Leed), and Paul Demitriades, for the Medina City Council (replacing Claudia Stelle). All input received will be provided to the Executive Committee as they reach their own recommendations on the EIS alternatives. Advisory Committee members not present on June 10 are encouraged to send in their input to the project team so that this can be included in the distributed materials.

Advisory Committee members brought up the following questions and points:

- Peter Hurley, Transportation Choices Coalition, asked if the project would provide the alternatives cost components/information. Pat Serie said this will be brought to the Advisory Committee at a later date.

- Dave Godfrey, City of Kirkland, asked for the project team to respond on the model assumptions and the effects of increased demand.

- Paul Demitriades, Medina City Councilmember, offered Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) pricing seminar information for the project.

PRICING AND MANAGED LANES APPROACH

Les Rubstello, WSDOT-Urban Corridors Office (UCO), introduced the current work for pricing and managed lane evaluation. The project team is studying four pricing/managed lane scenarios. The evaluation includes I-405 project improvements rather than current conditions. Regional analysis looks at tolling on all the major corridors, including the Alaskan Way Viaduct, SR 509, and SR 520. A second regional analysis includes tolling on I-90 and I-5. The study will consider how much diversion occurs from tolled roadways and what is the possible revenue generated over time. Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, noted that research has looked at the objectives of managing person throughput on the corridor and maximizing BRT lane efficiency. Les Rubstello stated that more pricing/managed lane information will be available at the end of June.

The following points and questions were noted in discussion:

- Virginia Gunby, Thousand Friends of Washington, asked if the analysis covers diversion impacts on local neighborhoods. She discussed a state law that requires tolling on all major bridges within five miles from a tolled bridge.

- Janet Ray, AAA Washington, suggested that the project examine partially tolling new capacity.

- Peter Hurley, Transportation Choices Coalition, asked if the scenarios only looked at tolling new capacity. Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, stated that the project is examining a variety of pricing scenarios. For the SR-520 project, the team has looked at managing two lanes with a carpool lane at 2+ and 3+. The project is pricing the SR-520 6-lane option, pricing SR-520 and I-90 with lane management, and introducing pricing permutations.

- Jim MacIsaac, Eastside Transportation Commission, asked if the project team found that with full pricing all the HOV lanes would be not need to be solely for HOV (that painted diamonds are not needed).

- Jonathan Dubman, Montlake Community Club, asked if the studies are looking at late afternoon/evening congestion pricing. Les Rubstello stated that the project team has looked at varying cost to the time of day and that they are not proposing any of the managed/pricing lane strategies at this point.

- Peter Hurley asked how the project derived trip mode assumptions. Jeff responded that the pricing is being done according to the state model. Work has looked outside of the model with mode switch and the project team is examining reasonable model assumptions. It has been difficult to assess benefits. Florida has several years of pricing modeling, but Washington does not yet have this experience. Peter emphasized the importance of quantifying pricing benefits.

- Eugene Wasserman, Neighborhood Business Council, asked if the pricing study has included the Washington State Ferries fare increase. He is concerned over economic impacts from additional pricing.

- Paul Demitriades, Medina City Councilmember, encouraged the project to look at full cost recovery, as done for the Tacoma Narrows Bridge. He questioned whether there will be a fare break for vehicles using multiple tolled corridors.

ADDRESSING LOCALIZED IMPACTS CRITERIA- FOLLOW-UP FROM JANUARY 30 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, led a discussion on the current EIS methodology work. She focused on the project's response to Richard Conlin's (Seattle City Councilmember) motion for

environmental review. For the EIS analysis, noise walls will be included in the project description (integral and inseparable). Noise levels will be measured at 5 feet off ground and 15 feet where there is second story outdoor use, and at both peak-hour Leq and 24-hour average daily Ldn. There will be over 90 noise monitoring locations. The project team has been meeting with Seattle's N.O.I.S.E. group to go over noise analysis.

For air quality analysis, the project team has proposed gathering ambient air quality data from seven monitoring stations in the region. Emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides, and volatile organic compounds will be estimated using regional emission data and forecasted from average daily traffic. Temporary particulate matter air quality impacts will be discussed in the construction impacts section of the EIS methodology report.

Lorie discussed other proposed analyses. The project will look at changes in both quantity and quality of stormwater and will provide mapping to illustrate impacts both inside and outside of existing right of way. The EIS and 4(f) Appendix will analyze parkland impacts, and local intersections analysis will determine whether traffic volumes will meet level of service (LOS) standards or better than the no-action alternative. The study will show how population and employment shifts over time compared to the no-action alternative. The visual quality portion will include views from key viewpoints of elevated structures, as well as other structures such as lids and noise walls. Neighborhood connectivity is one measure which will be used to determine impacts on the social structure of neighborhoods. EIS impact methodology report information will be available by element on the Trans-Lake project website (http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/translake/calendar.htm#past).

During this discussion, the following input was provided:

- Hans Aschenbach, Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance, asked if all the noise monitoring locations will measure noise at 15 feet and how close noise would be monitored from the station. Lorie stated that there will be a representative sample of a second story home throughout the corridor in order to develop noise contouring information. Noise measuring will be done at 5 and 15 feet to calibrate a model.

- Jean Amick, Laurelhurst Community Council, questioned what vehicle speed will be used for noise monitoring. Lorie stated that noise monitoring will be done under the noisiest conditions, which will be at 55 mph. Jean wondered if there would be a noise monitoring site north of Union Bay. She questioned how far north intersections will be studied and Lorie Parker answered that analyses will reach 65th Avenue.

- Gregory Hill, Streeter Architects, suggested considering the I-90 noise effects and how the corridor has gotten louder over time. Les Rubstello noted that Federal Aviation Administration measures noise levels at 25 feet for plane noise impacts. For a highway project not analyzing overhead plane traffic, noise levels will be recorded at 15 feet and 5 feet according to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations.

- Paul Demitriades encouraged the project team to utilize Medina's noise monitoring stations at SR-520 and any other available stations, with a control. He requested information on stormwater runoff modeling.

- Peter Hurley asked if particulate matter comparison will be done after before and after construction. He requested quantitative information on air quality analysis. Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill, noted that the Puget Sound Clean Air Association also requested qualitative and quantitative air quality analysis descriptions. Peter questioned if the project has looked at the impacts of possible construction delays for each of the alternatives. He would like more information on how the project will be handling transit demand. Peter asked how noise impacts imposed on people will be measured.

- Eugene Wasserman suggested that the project analyze additional pollution impacts from increased bus traffic on the SR-520 corridor. He pointed out the importance of identifying where vehicles are originating to derive traffic sources.

INTRODUCTION OF HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT ACCOMMODATION APPROACH

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, presented summary-level information on the project accommodation of high capacity transit. The project is looking at not precluding investments today for HCT in the future, as directed by the Executive Committee. The future has been defined as 30 to 50 years from now.

Jeff explained four HCT scenarios for the SR-520 project. Options include: adding no HCT accommodation, preserving HCT on SR-520 corridor, providing HCT accommodations on the SR-520 bridge and its approaches, and HCT highway design. Variations between the options are dramatic. There will be additional cost and environmental impact analysis done. The HCT work will be brought before the Executive Committee and a decision for this will be scheduled for July.

Discussion yielded the following questions and points:

- Jim MacIsaac asked for clarification on the definition of HCT. Jeff responded that for this project HCT will only include fixed guideway technologies. Jim asked what the project would do if the SR 520 Bridge was to sink in 50 years.

- Jonathan Dubman noted that a 30-foot right of way might inflate cost. He wondered in what sense is BRT not considered to be a form of HCT. He is curious about what the true advantage is for a fixed guideway system versus a BRT system.

- Elizabeth Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point, explained how there is new information on the various HCT technologies available. She questioned the HCT right-of-way data and the way which this was provided. She recommended analyzing existing HCT systems in the EIS. She asked if the project was looking at a specific technology.

- Hans Aschenbach asked for clarification on the matrix concerning buying and constructing right of way (column 3 and 4). He also mentioned confusion on the wording (designed by and constructed were confusing) and requested the use of verbs for descriptions.

- Jeff Peacock emphasized that there are no project-level drawings available yet.

- Gregory Hill asked the project to not make this so difficult. He asked why is it not possible for the project to say that there is no future right of way, like in LA. The project should point out where right-of-way would go and try to receive federal funding.

DEFINITION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES- COMMUNITY DESIGN WORKSHOPS

Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues, described the community design workshop highlights. The workshops consisted of an overview presentation followed by smaller breakout sessions. Overall themes of the community design workshops were:

- Maintain pedestrian/bicycle path continuity and increase it beyond what the team had proposed.
- Look at the tradeoffs of relocating access, ramp locations, etc.
- Explore transportation demand management (TDM).
- Provide more detailed information on noise wall locations and height.
- Support the I-5/SR-520 and I-405/SR-520 interchange improvements regardless if rest of project is built.
- Request further discussion regarding property acquisition and mitigation.

Brad mentioned that there was concern on how the new SR-520 facility would specifically impact people's property and how this would affect real estate. Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, stated that the community design workshop summaries will be posted on the project website. She noted that there have been a series of University of Washington meetings and the project team plans on meeting with jurisdictions to discuss these issues. Workshop attendance has greatly increased and the workshops have provided many answers to public inquiries. The project plans on continuing this type of outreach.

Discussion on the community design workshop outreach produced the following points and questions:

- Jean Amick asked what input did the University of Washington (UW) provide. Pat Serie stated that the UW wanted more information on impacts. The UW asked the project to be careful about displacing parking at medical facilities, impacting new facilities and stated that they do not have an official position yet. Peter Dewey stated that the UW also does not want additional general purpose traffic.

- Eugene Wasserman questioned whether the project has looked at buying impacted Montlake homes to save the project money and energy and offer the home owners a substantial price. Les Rubstello noted that Referendum 51 would provide funding. He noted that they are prohibited by law to buy out speculative land. There will be continued discussions concerning these issues.

- Kingsley Joneson requested more information on noise wall and lidding locations, along with possible landscaping plans.

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

John Shadoff, WSDOT, and Jean Mabry, WSDOT, have spent the last six months expanding the TDM plan, coordinating with the I-405 project. He noted the TDM opportunities throughout the region and that work is being done to develop a shared regional TDM strategy. The TDM program would vary according to the alternative chosen, with more TDM funding for the 4 and 6-lane options and less for the 8-lane option (due to the added general purpose capacity).

The 4-lane alternative would have the most extensive outreach and funding to encourage transit ridership. TDM outreach typically has not been done at the scale that is being proposed for the Trans-Lake Washington project. Many of the benefits are built up in Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) 2030 model. They are recommending an umbrella organization to oversee the TDM program.

John noted that Washington is a national leader with implementing successful TDM programs. The University of Washington U-Pass program has been highly successful. Commute trip reduction has been in place for 10 years and has achieved a 1% reduction of daily trips in this region. Washington Mutual has increased employee telecommuting and the University Village employees all have a bus pass. Washington State Ferries has a widely used vanpool program.

John stated that the SR-520 corridor has high percentages of commuting trips. The project team identified seven areas that make up the majority of origins and destinations – downtown Seattle, Kirkland/Totem Lake, Redmond/Overlake, downtown and northwest Bellevue, northwest Seattle, University District, and east central Seattle. The Trans-Lake TDM program is based on interlocal agreements to reduce SOV trips, first recommended in the initial Trans-Lake Washington Study. The proposal is patterned after BROTS, and is supported by an FTA grant. John discussed that the key to accountability is an oversight committee that has the ability to adjust the TDM program as it progresses, ensuring that successful TDM programs are continued and increased. The TDM program goals are to reduce the rate of growth of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in the Corridor Overall and increase person throughput on the Bridge.

John explained that the TDM program would work by having individual corridors determine their specific needs and focus. The Trans-Lake Washington and I-405 project TDM funding would overlap, allowing some of the SR-520 money to be redistributed. The TDM program will be refined in the EIS process and formalized in a corridor level agreement.

For the TDM portion of discussion, the following input was provided:

- Virginia Gunby suggested a commitment from WSDOT that TDM will be funded. She asked where this is mentioned in the regional package. Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT-UCO, stated that the TDM is embedded in project cost estimates. Referendum 51 funding ($100 million) will not cover TDM funding but will help continue EIS analysis.

- Peter Hurley stated that it is incumbent to find a TDM revenue source built in the projects for generations. He recommends incorporating a funding source for any phase of the project. He stated that adaptive management is a good step forward but that the legitimacy question has been raised. He noted that while there is broad support for TDM strategies, there are questions about the adaptability of the programs. A simple conversion is to be paid for the performance through a public/private partnership. He suggested that the project investigate telecommuting benefits, because reducing person delay does not capture the benefit of people not making the trip. He suggested the project look for a pay-for-performance program for the TDM analysis.

- Eugene Wasserman would like specific information on how the project would work on reducing trips in the SR-520 corridor. He would like to know for example, how many Microsoft employees are telecommuting and how many trips were reduced. He is interested on information on how to change behaviors.

- Jim MacIsaac asked for the project to look for accomplishments in 25 years and for the past 25 years. He suggested adding the goal of reducing delay for the SR-520 TDM program. He noted that the project should explore working with tolling options.

- Gregory Hill asked if park and ride lots are included in the TDM funding.

- Barbara Culp questioned if bicycling strategies/incentives will be included in the TDM funding. She would like to offer incentive ideas for bicycling. John Shadoff stated that non-motorized will be handled separately outside of the TDM study.

- Jean Amick asked whether bicycling is included in the TDM improvement percentages. She noted that it seems odd to spend less money on TDM in the 8-lane alternative compared to the other alternatives. John Shadoff stated that less money is being allocated to TDM in the 8-lane alternative due to the additional general purpose capacity taking out the incentive for vanpooling, etc. The 6-lane alternative has a huge TDM incentive with the added HOV lane.

STATE AND REGIONAL FUNDING STATUS

Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT-UCO, provided a state and regional transportation project funding update. She described how UCO has looked at project options and derived value for risks and opportunities on transportation corridors. UCO has provided accurate project information for

decision-makers in order to establish public expectations on transportation project investments, using a systematic cost estimate validation process. This process involved working with regional and national experts to review scopes and cost estimates or identify project benefits, estimate cost ranges, and define cost/schedule risks.

Maureen stated that project summaries include multiple options without the preferred option selected, full/partial funding scenarios, a project description with benefits, schedule assumptions to adjust estimates to midpoint construction dates for inflation, project cost probability ranges at the current state of design, and major risk factors and unknowns to which cost estimates are subject. Project cost estimates are in dollar ranges rather than a single figure. Specific project risk considerations are identified and described, along with likely project construction schedules.

She noted the key findings for the Trans-Lake Washington project, which are that cost estimates for the three options remained within the ranges previously identified and that several key areas of risk were found. Identified SR-520 risk areas are: the cut-and-cover tunnel under the Montlake Cut, SR-520/I-405 interchange restructuring, construction in environmentally sensitive areas, and vulnerability of floating and fixed bridges to catastrophic events. The Trans-Lake Washington project (Seattle to Redmond) full funding scenarios were provided to the group. The cost estimate validation process (CEVP) results ranged from $1.8 billion to $7.4 billion for the 4 and 8-lane options, including inflation for the construction mid-point.

As the region faces funding shortfalls, phasing of major projects is anticipated. Maureen suggested implementation principles to help design a phase that has the highest potential for reducing risk in the corridor, provide for a continuous usable facility with added mobility, improve the existing conditions of the environmental impacts, and meet the consensus vision for the corridor. She noted that the project shared some of this information at the Executive Committee, Financing Sub-Committee. She stated that the description of the SR-520 phases are to: replace the floating bridge and approach structures from east of Montlake Boulevard to 80th Avenue; add expanded roadway shoulders and bicycle/pedestrian paths; include one 300-500 foot lidded section of the freeway; provide noise walls in this section; and provide environmental mitigation. The first phase funding would include wider pontoons. The time needed for building the floating bridge would drive the schedule.

During the funding discussion, the following input was provided:

- Eugene Wasserman pointed out that the phasing should be from Montlake to Medina not Seattle to Medina. He asked for information on the minimum costs and on what each segment shows.

- Jim MacIsaac questioned whether the Portage Bay Viaduct would have to be replaced for seismic retrofitting requirements. He would like to see the Portage Bay and I-5 interchange costs.

- Peter Hurley wanted to know where the end point is on the western cost estimates.

- Virginia Gunby questioned why the information only includes cost estimates for midpoint construction rather than completed construction.

- Jim Reckers asked what inflation rate was used in this model. Maureen responded that it is about 3 %.

- Jeff Peacock pointed out that the proposed phase 1 lid is at Evergreen Point Road. Gregory Hill suggested an explanation of lidding locations for the proposed phasing. He noted that the document suggests that the lid on the Evergreen Point Road is a minimal requirement.

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, described the current interchange designs for the Trans-Lake Washington project. The project team has been working hard on refining interchange locations and options, in conjunction with local jurisdictions.

I-5 and Montlake Interchanges

Jeff stated that the I-5 interchange has not had any substantive changes since we last talked. The HOV lanes tie into I-5 express lanes southbound on the right side verses the left side. The project has plans that reverse the I-5 southbound off ramp (on the left side). There could be two homes impacted on the eastern corner. The 4-lane alternative includes southbound express lanes and the 6 and 8-lane alternatives merges into the northbound express lanes.

Jeff described that the project team has developed three interchange options for the Montlake area, two for the 6-lane alternative and one for the 8-lane alternative. The basic interchange layout remains unchanged. The bicycle/pedestrian path would depart from Montlake Boulevard. There is a braided ramp to the University District that comes from the middle going across general purpose traffic with a dedicated separation to the Montlake Boulevard off-ramp structure. The 6-lane option for Montlake Boulevard either widens the Montlake Bridge on one or both sides while keeping with historical integrity. Current engineering work consolidates the 'ramps to nowhere.' The transit flyer stop has been moved to the middle of the facility. The engineering work for the 8-lane alternative provides a second Montlake crossing with a tunnel under the Montlake Cut. Several of the options show that the traffic volumes dropping significantly on Montlake Boulevard. The project will only look at expansions on Montlake Boulevard for HOV access.

East of Lake Washington

Jeff Peacock stated that the interchange drawings for the area east of Lake Washington have not changed significantly since the Executive Committee last met. There has been work done with providing a smooth ramp to Bellevue Way and there will be continued work with a flyer stop at Evergreen Point Road. All the current movements at the I-405 interchange will be carried forward in project alternatives. For the 8-lane alternative, a ramp has been provided to the

Redmond Town Center. There will be more work done with providing HOV access to the SR 202 connection.

The following questions and points were provided:

- Elizabeth Newstrum is concerned about the Points communities' access at 104th Avenue. She requested a copy of the eastside high-rise drawings to examine nature preserve, bicycle/pedestrian path, and wetland impacts.

- Gregory Hill requested that the project preserve the pedestrian crossings from Montlake Boulevard to Husky Stadium. Barbara Culp questioned what would happen to the road to the Museum of History and Industry.

- Mitch Wasserman asked what kind of light rail accommodation will be done.

- Jim MacIsaac mentioned concern that he heard at the Medina meeting with preserving eastbound and southbound access to Bellevue. The current design takes them to three signals and makes access more difficult.

Lidding Options

Jeff Peacock explained the project lidding options. He pointed out that the lidding options are integral to the project and sized to not require ventilation, based on guidance from the previous Trans-Lake Washington project Executive Committee meeting (January 30, 2002).

Jeff noted that lidding provides community connectivity advantages for the Roanoke area, although there are slope difficulties with building a lid on 10th Avenue. The project has proposed a 500-foot lid in the Montlake neighborhood, extending just west and east of Montlake Boulevard. He stated that there might be flyer stop advantages with a lid gap. A BRT station under a lid has safety issues and would not be very pedestrian friendly. The project has proposed 500-foot lids at Evergreen Point Road and at 82nd to 92nd Avenue. Jeff emphasized that the project will work closely with each community on exact lidding and flyer stop locations and the function of flyer stops. The flyer stops will have to be located in the middle of the roadway.

The following points and questions were brought up at this time:

- Jim MacIsaac asked if the proposed Roanoke lid would go across Boylston Avenue. He also suggested extended bridges in some areas like on Mercer Island.

- Mark Weed requested a meeting with the eastside transportation board. He questioned why the SR-520 project is not part of the TEA-21 (28 projects) being moved forward.

NEXT STEPS

The next Advisory/Technical Committee meeting will be on June 27 at the University of Washington Horticultural Center. The next Executive Committee meeting will be on July 9 at the Museum of History and Industry. Pat Serie asked that all the Advisory Committee participants provide comments to her about today's discussion as soon as possible.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Response to Conlin Motion on Environmental Impacts to be Studied and Mitigated
- Richard Conlin, City of Seattle Councilmember, comment from January 30, 2002
- Transportation Demand Management Element Definition and Evaluation Report
- SR-520 Corridor: Montlake to Bellevue Way High Capacity Transit Accommodation Scenarios
- Trans-Lake Washington Common Themes from Community Design Workshops
- Project Interchange Drawings
- Presentation on State and Regional Funding Status
- Public Comment from Paul Demitriades (For Whom the (Toll) Bells Toll?)

ACTION ITEMS

- Provide more detailed information on the HCT approach, TDM program, and on the state and regional funding work.
- Elizabeth Newstrum requested a copy of the eastside high-rise drawings to examine nature preserve, bicycle/pedestrian path, and wetland impacts.
- Kingsley Joneson requested more information on noise wall and lidding locations, along with possible landscaping plans.
- Mark Weed requested a meeting with the eastside transportation board.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

Present		
X	Amick	Jean
	Andrews	Deborah
X	Aschenbach	Hans
X	Culp	Barbara
X	Demitriades	Paul
	Dent	Bob
X	Dubman	Jonathan
X	Eades	Bertha
X	Gunby	Virginia
	Hallenbeck	Mark
	Hart	Fred
X	Hill	Jim
X	Hill	Gregory
	Holman	Linda
X	Hurley	Peter
X	Joneson	Kingsley
X	MacIsaac	Jim
	McKinley	Kirk
X	Newstrum	Elizabeth
X	Ray	Janet
X	Reckers, Jr.	James
	Resha	John
	Sheck	Ronald
X	Tate	Bob
	Tochterman	Thomas B.
X	Wasserman	Eugene
X	Weed	Mark
	White	Rich
X	White	Roland
	Wyble	John

Other attendees

Mike Lindblom, Seattle Times
Janet Roach

Project Team

Les Rubstello, WSDOT-UCO
Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT-UCO
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
Jennifer Cannon, EnviroIssues

JJC

ADDITIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMENTS:

May 23, 2002

FOR WHOM THE (TOLL) BELLS TOLL?

Tolls say legislators, state/county bureaucrats and electeds, are in our future – we need tolls, gas/sales tax increases and higher vehicle excise fees to finance multiple mega-billon $, mega-projects.

As a hypothetical example, using documented toll rates for the 2nd Tacoma Narrows bridge, projected to start at $3.00, increasing to $5.00 round-trip in 3-5 years. I've estimated tolls a West Seattle, daily commuter might pay, for a cross-lake round trip to Redmond:

Road Segment	Initial Daily Toll	Outyear Daily Toll
1. Alaskan Way Viaduct	$3	$5
2. SR-520	$4	$6
3. I-405/SR-167	$4	$6
	$11	$17

Recently, a Transportation Commissioner, offered that tolls could be re-instated on the I-90 bridges; SR-520 toll paying commuters could not get a "free ride."

Projects would be financed by long-term bonds, backed by toll revenues. The 2nd Tacoma Narrows Bridge is estimated to cost $800 M+, (including financing costs for 4 1/2 years – until completion.)

Our West Seattle/Redmond commuter – would pay $2,750/year, escalating to $4,250/year. Suggestions for $1 tolls for each segment – are unrealistic based on the 2nd Narrows bridge financial projections. WSDOT initially promised Tacoma Narrows commuters a $1 toll!
Not to worry, an EZ-PASS electronic toll collection system – will debit your on-line account (adding credit card debt), and provide spending/travel patterns to telemarketers. Vehicles will carry a transponder, roadside surveillance video cameras will record license plate numbers.

Taxpayers/toll payers should ask at least, 2 questions: (1) what public process/who will set and revise tolls? And (2) how will personal privacy be protected?

Are you excited? Can you hardly wait for the Nov. 5, 2002 ballot(s)? The toll bells toll for you!

Paul B. Demitriades
Is a Medina City Council member
and alternate member Executive
Committee Trans-Lake WA. Project.

-----Original Message-----
From: Bob Tate
To: pserie@enviroissues.com
Sent: 6/11/02 2:50 PM
Subject: Comments following Advisory Committee meeting of June10, 2002

I remain impressed by the volume of work by WSDOT and the consultant team and to the attention to detail included (as well as their ability to remember these details and articulate them to the committee.) I also commend WSDOT on the format of the new cost estimates. Yesterday's lengthy discussion of TDM was fascinating. I count myself as one whose interest in innovation is high, but I was constantly brought down to earth during our discussion by recent events. Following the recent release of the new cost estimates, Dave Ross of KIRO discussed the 520 costs, asking "How can an expensive bike lane be included when it does not significantly contribute to the goal of moving people and goods across the lake (especially during the nine-month rainy season)?"

Secondly, the comments by a leading politico during a private conversation: "Can you imagine asking the public to fund a new bridge without an added GP lane"

Thirdly, was the realization expressed in the TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT ELEMENT DEFINITION AND EVALUATION REPORT and mentioned again yesterday, that the TDM measures do not replace the need for roadway investments due to the latent demand in the corridor. These items suggest to me that the need to educate the public prior to the election is both critical and extremely difficult. But the average voter would more quickly understand" taking care of the latent demand" than grasping the new TDM concepts, though both are important. So I suggest a "catch up, move ahead" approach to selling our product to the public. With the catch up goes an added GP lane and an added HOV lane. With the move ahead goes new concepts for the HOV lane,/BRT plans, TDM measures, etc. The voting public would have difficulty, in my view, moving ahead without catching up. The catch up phase becomes the foundation for moving ahead. Getting the voters to conceptualize the predicted benefits of various TDM measures will be a formidable task.

Finally, I encourage the decision-makers to avoid cutting corners due to the competition for funds. If we need to complete the project in stages, so be it. But we have a rare opportunity to make major transportation improvements between major population centers with limited complications.

Other thoughts. If the new bridge life is 75 years and Sound Transit does not plan HCT on 520 in the foreseeable 50-year period, I suggest no expenditure of currents funds to plan for HCT. With only one sailboat needing the 70 ft. high bridge, could the Coast Guard be convinced to lower the requirement by the time the bridge is built? It is my understanding that today’s cranes do not require such height. Giving the sailboat owner 8-10 years warning might be enough. With Dave Ross already broaching the subject of the bike lane it is even more important that we be totally open and straight-forward about its inclusion in the project(as we should be with every

other item) Even though the committees all want it to be included we cannot be perceived as hiding its cost.

Bob Tate, Advisory Committee

-----Original Message-----
From: Hans Aschenbach [mailto:hasch57@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2002 5:54 PM
To: Peacock, Jeffrey; pserie@enviroissues.com; Grotefendt, Amy; 'Amy'; Peacock, Jeffrey
Cc: Lane, Theodore (Lane, Theodore); Gibson, Paul; Easton, Clarissa; Tim Ceis; Amick, Jean; Anne Fiske Zuniga; Richard Conlin; Dewey, Peter; Dubman, Jonathan; Eric Chipps; Fong Michael; Grace Crunican; Fred Hart; Heidi Wills; Hill, Greg; Leed, Jean; MarkW@fishprop.com; Noel Schoneman; Susan Sanchez
Subject: Trans-Lake Project (Seattle Group)- Montlake Bridge

Dear Project Team and Seattle Committee Members,

I would like to restate in writing the NARROW criteria that I believe would allow for a Community dialogue about an adjustment to the Montlake Bridge in conjunction with the Trans-Lake Washington Project. We all know that these and other (broader) criteria that have been mentioned are for study purposes only. However I fear that if the criteria drift far beyond the narrow criteria I list below, Community sensitivity on the Montlake Bridge issue will end any discussion before it starts.

1) Widening of the bridge to 6 lanes must conform to other related projects proposed for Montlake Blvd area. i.e. the 2 additional Montlake Bridge lanes under discussion must be for HOV traffic only. (The University Area Transportation Study [chapter 8] proposes numerous HOV lane projects for Montlake Blvd, NE Pacific St., and SR 520 on / off ramps.)

2) The project must scrupulously and generously observe the historic design of the bridge i.e. the Bridge must remain a single span and change in only one dimension- width.

3) We must use this opportunity to update the mechanical elements of the drawbridge.

4) The Bridge roadway must remain open during the bulk of construction. This suggests fixing the Bridge in place during construction of new abutments and mechanical replacement. A permit would have to be obtained from the Coast Guard to allow disruption of shipping from Lake Washington. The old span would then be removed and the new one moved into place with minimal diversion of local and regional road traffic.

I know that you have incorporated a lot of this into your thinking. Some however is new because it hasn't been well articulated by me in the past. I hope that these suggestions will help shape a better project.

Than you for your attention,

Hans Aschenbach, Trans-Lake Advisory Committee Member

-----Original Message-----
From: Hans Aschenbach [mailto:hasch57@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2002 6:14 PM
To: Peacock, Jeffrey; pserie@enviroissues.com; Grotefendt, Amy; Peacock, Jeffrey
Cc: Gunby, Virginia
Subject: Trans-Lake Question on TDM Effectiveness

Dear Project Team,
My question relates to the Table on page 6-5-02 in the TDM Report of 5 June 2002.

I understand that an 8 lane alignment for SR 520 would offer more roadway for SOVs than smaller alternatives. More roadway is a disincentive to effective TDM. Thus TDM would be less effective in an 8 lane configuration than with a 6 lane configuration.

The 4 lane configuration again offers less roadway than a 6 lane configuration AND assumes more in the way of monetary incentives. With more money and less roadway, why is TDM less effective for 4 lanes than it is for 6 lanes? Something is counterintuitive here and I can't see it.

Hans Aschenbach, Trans-Lake Advisory Committee member

-----Original Message-----
From: Mabry, Jean
To: 'hasch57@msn.com'
Cc: 'vgunby@aol.com'; 'Amy Grotefendt '; Rubstello, Les; Shadoff, John; Mabry, Jean; 'Jeff Peacock (E-mail 2) '; 'Patricia Serie '
Sent: 6/12/02 11:52 AM
Subject: RE: Trans-Lake Question on TDM Effectiveness

Hi Hans,

It is not just the number of lanes that influence the "effectiveness" of the TDM program (and related level of investment) but the type of lanes (HOV vs. GP). The 4-lane does not have HOV lanes on the bridge, making it much more challenging to implement a TDM program to increase person-throughput on the bridge since it doesn't offer the "incentive" for HOV on the bridge and creates conditions that increase switch-overs to other routes (Seattle staff have said that this is already starting to happen with taxi companies having their drivers avoid the bridges during peak times and using local arterials to go around the lake).

The addition of HOV lanes in the 6-lane provides an "incentive" to HOV with travel times that are more competitive than the GP lanes. And as you noted, the addition of GP lanes in the 8-lane are a "disincentive" to HOV with less competitive travel times.

Please let me know if you need any additional information - Jean

Jean Mabry, WSDOT - PPO, TDM Resource Center, 206-389-3038

To: Trans-Lake Washington Project
From: Jonathan Dubman
Re: Advisory Committee meeting June 10

June 11, 2001

As requested, I am submitting further thoughts on yesterday's Advisory Committee meeting that time did not permit us to discuss.

PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE CONNECTIVITY

At the May Community Design Workshop in Montlake, the Project heard concerns from Montlake residents about the placement of the ped/bike lane north of SR-520. Concerns over the width of the freeway in that segment are, of course, very well founded. I do, however, appreciate the notion of trying to connect ped/bicycle traffic from east of Montlake Blvd. to the Montlake Playfield area without having to cross Montlake Blvd. This would represent a very significant improvement in non-motorized connectivity in the area, leveraging the investment in ped/bike access on SR-520, and I encourage the Project to accommodate this movement in a neighborhood-friendly way.

Let me also express my satisfaction in seeing a non-motorized connection to Madison Park near public shore at 37th Ave. E being given serious consideration. I believe this connection would accomplish a great deal in terms of connectivity and mobility (Madison Park to Montlake, UW and Arboretum and Flyer stops; a level bike route around Lake Washington, fewer bike/vehicular conflicts in the Arboretum, etc.) while avoiding many of the environmental and other concerns that some expressed about previous trail proposals connecting to this area. In terms of mobility improvements per dollar expended, this concept has to rank very high indeed.

CAPACITY OF MONTLAKE BRIDGE

It is important that a wide range of options be explored to try and maximize use of the Montlake Bridge in order to maximize the viability of options that do not replace, widen or build a new structure alongside the Montlake Bridge. Having extensively observed existing traffic patterns, I believe we are not achieving maximal capacity across the current bridge. I believe that two significant factors in limiting capacity of the Montlake Bridge are the timing of the signals at Shelby and Hamlin, and the weaving motions performed by traffic exiting SR 520 westbound destined for Pacific Street.

Has the project considered either the following ideas, in isolation or in combination?

1. rush-hour left turn restrictions from Hamlin and Shelby onto Montlake Blvd.

2. moving the Montlake/Pacific interchange to NE Pacific Place as suggested by the University Area Transportation Study.

CAPACITY OF 4-LANE ALTERNATIVE

Clearly, a 4-lane freeway built to modern standards would have some measure of higher capacity than the current configuration of SR 520. Various claims have been made, up to a 35% increase (from about 1600 to 2200 vehicles per hour per lane.) What methodology is the Project using to assess capacity improvements on SR 520 due to improved sight lines, shoulder width, etc. in the 4-lane build alternative vs. No Action? If the model does not take these issues into account, why not, and what can be done about it?

Given the potential of the 4-lane alternative to offer significant increase in vehicular capacity, and given the costs (of all kinds) associated with even the smaller 6-lane alternative, the 4-lane alternative deserves serious consideration.

In keeping with that goal, I would like to see the EIS look at the possibility of a 4-lane SR-520 combined some or all of the interchange improvements at I-5. Also, a transit-only queue jump lane is worth exploring for westbound SR-520 to northbound Montlake Blvd.

COORDINATION WITH SOUND TRANSIT

Given that Sound Transit is a co-lead agency on this Project, I would hope to see more effective assumptions being made regarding the Central Link project. I will be very disappointed if the EIS assumes the LPA for Central Link (with station at 15th/Pacific) if a different preferred alternative is established while the EIS is being written. We have before us a historic opportunity to coordinate these very significant transportation investments.

I am interested in understanding the implications for this project if a Montlake cut alignment is chosen for Central Link, with a South Campus station stop. Many believe this to be the leading contender at this point and thus it is really the smartest assumption for the Trans-Lake EIS to make. I am particularly interested in the opportunities for transfer between transit on SR 520 and Central Link. Furthermore, even though it is unclear at this point what will be built as a result of TLWP, and when, I would like to see this information fed back into the North Link SEIS in order to document the potential increased ridership due to transfer opportunities with transit on SR 520. Dealing with such uncertainties is not uniquely confined to Central Link; there are similar issues related to I-405.

If it is beyond the authority of the Trans-Lake Washington Project to see to it that this project coordination happens to the full extent possible, please let me know the proper authorities with which to take up the issue.

MAKING TRANSIT AS EFFECTIVE AS POSSIBLE

Transit should be a fast, dependable and comfortable experience. The popularity of transit on SR 520 despite lackluster performance in all three of these measures is evidence that there is a very high level of transit demand in this corridor.

The motivations for Sound Transit's long term plan to implement light rail in the I-90 corridor, which are primarily related to load balancing the system, are well understood. However, I-90 is a poor choice for cross-lake transit patrons whose origins and destinations include Seattle's north end and Redmond/Kirkland. Microsoft's Redmond campus, with 20,000 employees, and the University District, which is the second largest urban hub in Seattle outside of downtown, are both clearly much more convenient to the SR 520 corridor than to I-90. By far the highest ridership projections for Central Link under all alternatives being studied are in the segment north of downtown.

These are among the reasons why a high level of transit service for SR 520 is critical to the success of this project. BRT is currently the only transit service under consideration, except for the expressed desire to accommodate HCT in the SR 520 corridor in the very long term.

Among the challenges for BRT in the SR 520 corridor is that bus staging space is in short supply and on-street congestion levels are high in both downtown Seattle and the University District, which are the two primary destinations in the Project's preliminary BRT service concepts.

Furthermore, neither of the 6-lane alternatives under consideration by the Project at this time contains a grade-separated right of way for transit between the Eastside and the University District. There are clearly operational benefits that would be obtained for transit if such a connection could be built. The only grade-separated HOV access being studied is in conjunction with an 8-lane alternative. Given the controversy, high cost, high environmental and neighborhood impacts of this tunnel and the fact that it is tied to an additional 2 GP lanes coming into Seattle, which is contrary to Mayor Nickels' expressed intent, and Seattle's stated policy (1997 council resolution), it frankly seems an unlikely prospect.

Both 6-lane alternatives would require sending BRT through a series of traffic lights, over a bascule bridge, and into the congested University District. The resulting variability in travel time and reliability runs counter to the ideal of BRT and diminishes the value of the service.

One of many significant objections to the cut-and-cover tunnel under the Montlake cut is the fact that it forces the mainline of SR 520 to be raised 24 feet in the vicinity of MOHAI in order to allow the tunnel to pass underneath. A 4-lane cut-and-cover tunnel is also expensive and disruptive, and requires costly grade separation of the Pacific/Montlake interchange.

Trying to shoehorn a full 4-lane tunnel with full-directional HOV and GP access given the tight geometry of this area is obviously a very ambitious goal.

Perhaps the project should consider an alternative, hybrid concept as a later phase: A 2-lane bored transit-only tunnel from SR 520 that interfaces with Central Link at the South Campus station. The facility could be something like the Harvard Square bus tunnel next to the Red Line station in Cambridge. BRT buses could emerge further west on Pacific in order to serve the SW

campus of the University, and continue to Wallingford, Fremont, and Ballard on surface streets – much more cheaply than a full-on HCT line in that corridor, and meanwhile fulfilling some of the goals of the city of Seattle's Intermediate Capacity Transit study in that corridor.

The dream of such a connection, and some accommodation for it, could be classified as "future HCT accommodation" by the measures the project is currently considering, without a major shift in focus. The possibility of building such a connection in the future may obviate some of the perceived need to build a parallel span across the Montlake cut.

many thanks,
Jonathan Dubman

-----Original Message-----
From: Greg Hill [mailto:grhill@streeterarchitects.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 9:31 AM
To: Amy Grotefendt
Cc: Cynthia Sullivan (E-mail)
Subject: RE: Trans-Lake Washington Project Comments

Pat,

Here are my much abbreviated comments:

1. The veggie pizza was great.

2. Parks: Will prospective mitigation purchases be identified, or at least the guiding principles or requirements for purchase.?

3. TDM as proposed is a waste of money. $330 million dollars with no measurable outcome is the reason developers love TDM. Jeff's statement that there is no way to quantify TDM is accurate.

The land use component is the most critical as it could impact the pattern of development which is the problem...however the "solution" offered is hiring 3 FTE's.

The $330 million could pay for light rail from Montlake to Bellevue. The solution to the future is a more transit/pedestrian friendly pattern of development combined with a transit system, which both attracts and carries people. You can not ride an FTE or 'program' to work.

Q: Is the money for purchasing the BRT buses and operating them in some other part of the budget? If not then that is where the TDM should go.

4. Park and Ride is an impact not a solution. Making every transit rider auto-dependent to get to the P&R does not improve the pattern of development. More over the arterials leading to the 'freeway' will be even more congested. Where are the P&R's?

5. Jeff's model is predicting accurately that adding HOV lanes does not increase HOV use or decrease congestion due to triple convergence: people will switch modes, route and time of travel to fill the newly created spaces. Please DO NOT "tweek" the model to get a better outcome.

6. Can you confirm Jeff's statement that WSDOT does not/will not contribute to a non-rubber tired portion of a project. If so then the TDM goals are at odds with this statement.

Gregory Hill

-----Original Message-----
From: Jean Amick
To: Pat Serie; Richard Conlin; Richard McIver; Heidi Wills; Cynthia Sullivan
Cc: Rubstello, Les; Jeannie Hale; Jonathan Dubman; Peter Hurley
Sent: 6/12/02 12:02 AM
Subject: Trans Lake Advisory Comments

Hello Pat,

That was a very informative meeting yesterday.

Is the only noise and air quality monitoring site north of canal on NE 45th? (That is what I understood Lorie Parker to say yesterday at Advisory meeting.) If so, that is not adequate. For any and all reports, there should definitely be both noise and air quality monitoring stations on Webster Point in Laurelhurst. This area, located directly north of the bridge, is tremendously affected by the bridge traffic, especially the increased noise because of the worn out pavement on the west end.

Are all studies coordinated as to vehicle speed? E.G. a certain noise level at a certain speed means what time savings – more speed may mean less noise AND less time saved with present lanes and/or additional lanes.

Maximum revenue vs. maximum thru put is a vital question to be faced.

I agree with the following comments Hans Aschenbach submitted:
1) Widening of the bridge to 6 lanes must conform to other related projects proposed for Montlake Blvd area. i.e. the 2 additional Montlake Bridge lanes under discussion must be for HOV traffic only. (The University Area Transportation Study [chapter 8] proposes numerous HOV lane projects for Montlake Blvd, NE Pacific St., and SR 520 on / off ramps.)
JEAN'S (MY) ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THIS: MORE IMPORTANT IS THE FACT THAT ANY INCREASE IN LANES ON 520, MEAN INCREASED DEMAND...MONTLAKE

BLVD AND MONTLAKE BRIDGE WOULD NEED EXPANDING FOR HOV'S BEFORE ANY NEW BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION.

2) An 8 lane alignment for SR 520 would offer more roadway for SOVs than smaller alternatives. More roadway is a disincentive to effective TDM. Thus TDM would be less effective in an 8 lane configuration than with a 6 lane configuration.
3) The 4 lane configuration again offers less roadway than a 6 lane configuration AND assumes more in the way of monetary incentives. With more money and less roadway, why is TDM less effective for 4 lanes than it is for 6 lanes?
